UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,187	02/13/2004	Michael Timmons	SYB/0094.01	2186

31779   7590   12/12/2006

JOHN A. SMART
708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201
LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/708,187	TIMMONS, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly Lovel	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 September 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-59* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .   6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 26 September 2006.

2.   Claims 1-11 and 13-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 22 and 42 are

independent. Claims 1, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 42 and 59 have been amended and claim 12

has been canceled. This action is made Final.

3.   The rejections of claims 1-9, 12-14, 17-30, 33-35, 38-48, 51-52 and 54-59 as

being anticipated by US PGPub 2006/0053376 to Ng et al and of claims 10, 11, 15, 16,

31, 32, 36, 37, 49, 50 and 53 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2006/0053376 to

Ng et al in view of US PGPub 2004/0098360 to Witwer et al have been withdrawn as

necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 50 is objected to because the claim recites the limitation "said at least one

collaborative element. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim. It seems as if the claim should recite "said at least one listener element."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 of claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-41 and 59 as directed

to non-statutory subject matter are withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   **Claims 1-4, 9, 13, 14, 17-25, 30, 33-35, 38-44, 48, 51, 52, and 54-59 are**

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US PGPub 2004/0090969

to Jerrard-Dunne et al (hereafter Jerrard-Dunne).

        Referring to claim 1, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a method for interactive content

retrieval and display at a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network

30] and having Internet access (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the method comprising:

        providing a plurality of portlets [for example, portlets 48 A-E] selected by a user

[user 32 or portlet developer] from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28]

available via the Internet for retrieval of content for display (see [0026], lines 8-14;

[0030]; [0036], lines 1-7) in a user interface of the computer [user system 26];

        in response to user input, mapping a message action to a first portlet to create a

messaging portlet [the developer links desired fields together using a user interface]

(see [0031]) for sending a message to a registrar [broker system 42] in response to user

interaction with the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0036]-[0037] – when data is entered in the input field of the source portlet, the data is sent to the broker system);

creating a listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a second portlet [e.g. weather] selected by the user [developer] with the registrar [broker system 42] to receive messages from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0032] and [0037], lines 6-10);

in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet [a user 32 interacts with portlet data sharing system 10 through user system 26] (see [0025], lines 1-2 and [0036], lines 1-7), retrieving particular content for display in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]) based on the message received by the listener portlet [destination portlet] from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0033], lines 22-25; [0036]; and [0037]); and

displaying the particular content in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]).

Referring to claim 2, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said plurality of portlets comprise a portal [portal page 46 comprises of portlets 48A, 48B, 48C, 48D and 48E] (see [0028], lines 1-11 and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 3, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a portlet retrieves content from a particular source [another portlet or a content provider system] (see [0019], lines 4-8 and [0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 4, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein a portlet displays content in a Web page [portal page] (see [0028] and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 9, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said user interface comprises a browser interface (see [0020] – the user system 26 represents any type of computerized system that can be used to access the world wide web; therefore the interface of the user system is considered to represent a browser interface).

Referring to claim 13, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said registrar [mapping system] is located in a browser window [graphical user interface] (see [0031], lines 1-11 and [0032], lines 1-3).

Referring to claim 14, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web page (see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to claim 17, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the message received from said messaging portlet comprises a selected one of an identifier, text [i.e., city of departure], or an attribute (see [0036] and [0037], lines 1-10).

Referring to claim 18, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

creating a second listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a third portlet [i.e., Hotel; i.e., Weather could be the first listener] selected by the user with the registrar to receive messages from said messaging portlet [i.e., Airline Reservation] (see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B); and

in response to user interaction with said messaging portlet [source portlet], retrieving particular content for display in the user interface based on the message received by the second listener portlet [destination portlet] from the messaging portlet (see [0037], lines 1-10).

Referring to claim 19, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

mapping a message action to the listener portlet [destination portlet] (see [0031]-[0032]);

creating a second listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a third portlet [i.e., Car Rental; i.e., Hotel could be the first listener] selected by the user with the registrar to listen for messages from the listener portlet [Hotel] (see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B); and

in response to the message received by the listener portlet from the messaging portlet [source portlet], retrieving particular content for display in the user interface based on the message received by the second listener portlet from the listener portlet (see [0037]).

Referring to claim 20, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a computer-readable medium having processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (see [0010]).

Referring to claim 21, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: downloading set of processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (see [0010]; [0022]; and [0035]).

Referring to claim 22, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a system for interactive content retrieval and display at a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network 30] access and having Internet access (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the system comprising:

a user interface [input/output interface 18] for display of content (see [0020 and [0023]);

an actioner module [source portlet – portlets include a portlet program that includes the program code for obtaining the content displayed in the visual portlet (see [0019], lines 7-8)] for display of content selected by a user from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28] available via the internet in the user interface (see [0026], lines 8-14; [0030]; [0036], lines 1-7) and sending a message based on user interaction with said actioner module (see [0036]-[0037] – when data is entered in the input field of the source portlet, the data is sent to the broker system);

a registrar [broker system 42] for receiving the message from said actioner module [source portlet] and routing the message to at least one listener module [destination portlet] registered to receive the message (see [0037], lines 1-10); and

at least one listener module [destination portlet] selected by the user registered

for receiving the message from the registrar [broker system 42] (see [0032] and [0037],

lines 6-10) and retrieving and displaying content in the user interface based on the

message sent by the actioner module [source portlet] (see [0033], lines 22-25; [0036];

and [0037]).

Referring to claim 23, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, wherein

said actioner module [source portlet] comprises a portlet (see [0019], lines 7-8 and

[0028]).

Referring to claim 24, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 23, wherein

said portlet retrieves content from a particular source [another portlet or a content

provider system] (see [0019], lines 4-8 and [0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 25, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, wherein

at least one listener module [destination portlet] displays content in a Web page [portal

page] (see [0028] and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 30, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, wherein

said user interface comprises a browser interface (see [0020] – the user system 26

represents any type of computerized system that can be used to access the world wide

web; therefore the interface of the user system is considered to represent a browser

interface).

Referring to claim 33, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said at least one listener module [destination portlet] registers with the registrar to receive the message from the actioner module [source portlet] (see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 34, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 33, wherein the registrar [mapping system] is located in a browser window [graphical user interface] (see [0031], lines 1-11 and [0032], lines 1-3).

Referring to claim 35, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 34, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web page (see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to claim 38, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the message received by said at least one listener module [destination portlet] comprises a selected one of an identifier [identification of the destination field], text, or an attribute (see [0037], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 39, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, further comprising: a module [computer readable program code] (see [0010]) for mapping a message action to the actioner portlet [source portlet] (see [0031] and [0037], lines 4-6).

Referring to claim 40, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 22, further

comprising: a listener messaging module [destination portlet: i.e., Hotel portlet receives

city] registered to receive the message from the actioner module [source portlet: i.e.,

Airline Reservation portlet sends destination city] and send a message based on the

message received from the actioner module [Hotel portlet now sends the city to Car

Rental portlet] (see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 41, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the system of claim 40, wherein

said listener messaging module retrieves content for display in the user interface based

on the message sent by the actioner module (see [0036]-[0037]).

Referring to claim 42, Jerrard-Dunne discloses in a computer [user system 26]

connected to a network [network 30] and having Internet access, a method for

collaborative retrieval and display of information in a Web page (see Fig 1 and [0020]),

the method comprising:

retrieving [obtaining] (see [0026], lines 9-13) a plurality of elements [portlets]

selected by a user [user 32 or portlet developer] from a plurality of sources [content

provider system 28] available via the Internet for display of information in a Web page

[portal page] (see [0030] and [0036], lines 1-7);

creating a registrar [broker system 42] for receiving a message and routing the

message to at least one listening element [destination portlet] registered to receive the

message (see [0031] and [0037], lines 1-12);

associating a message action [mapping] specified by the user with a first element

[source portlet] for sending a message in response to user interaction with the first

element [source portlet] (see [0031] and [0037], lines 1-12);

registering at least one listener element [destination portlet] selected by the user

with the registrar for receiving a message sent by the first element [source portlet] (see

[0031]); and

in response to user interaction with the first element [source portlet], displaying

particular information on the Web page based on the message received by said at least

one listener element [destination portlet] from the first element [source portlet] (see

[0037], lines 1-12).

Referring to claim 43, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein

said plurality of elements [portlets] comprise a portal [portal page 46 comprises of

portlets 48A, 48B, 48C, 48D and 48E] (see [0028], lines 1-11 and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 44, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein

an element [portlet] retrieves information from a particular source [another portlet or a

content provider system] (see [0019], lines 4-8 and [0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 48, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein

said Web page [portal page] is displayed by a Web browser (see [0020] – the user

system 26 represents any type of computerized system that can be used to access the

world wide web; therefore the interface of the user system is considered to represent a

browser interface).

Referring to **claim 51**, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein said creating a registrar step includes creating the registrar in a browser window [graphical user interface] (see [0031], lines 1-11 and [0032], lines 1-3).

Referring to **claim 52**, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 51, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web page (see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to **claim 54**, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein the message received by said at least one listener element [destination portlet] comprises a selected one of an identifier [identification of the destination field], text, or an attribute (see [0037], lines 10-12).

Referring to **claim 55**, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein the first element [source portlet: i.e., Hotel portlet] comprises a listening element [destination portlet: i.e., the field city in the Hotel portlet] registered to receive a message from a particular element on the Web page [portlet on the portal page: i.e., Airline Reservation portlet] (see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to **claim 56**, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 55, wherein the first element [Hotel portlet] sends a message [city to the Car Rental portlet] when it receives a message [destination city] from said particular element [Airline Reservation portlet] (see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 57, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, wherein

at least some of said listener elements have associated message actions for sending

messages to other elements (see [0031] and Fig 3B – i.e., when the Hotel portlet

receives the destination city from the Airline Reservation portlet, it then sends the city to

the car rental portlet).

Referring to claim 58, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a computer-readable medium

having processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 42 (see

[0010]).

Referring to claim 59, Jerrard-Dunne discloses the method of claim 42, further

comprising: downloading a set of processor-executable instructions for performing the

method of claim 42 (see [0010] and [0022]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   **Claims 5, 6, 26, 27 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied

respectively to claims 4, 25 and 42 above, and further in view of Applicant's

Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA).

Referring to claim 5, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a web page. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the web page is implemented using a markup language. AAPA discloses how web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation wherein the Web page is implemented using a markup language (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne using a markup language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Jerrard-Dunne and AAPA (hereafter Jerrad/AAPA) discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the markup language comprises a selected one of HyperText Markup Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Extensible Hypertext Markup Language (XHTML), and Compact HyperText Markup Language (cHTML) (AAPA: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 26, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a web page. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the web page is implemented using a markup language. AAPA discloses how web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation wherein the Web page is implemented using a markup language (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne using a markup language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

Referring to claim 27, the combination of Jerrard-Dunne and AAPA (hereafter Jerrard/AAPA) discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the markup language comprises a selected one of HyperText Markup Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Extensible Hypertext Markup Language (XHTML), and Compact HyperText Markup Language (cHTML) (AAPA: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 45, Jerrard-Dunne discloses displaying a portlet in a portal page [Web page]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the Web page comprises a markup language. AAPA discloses how web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation wherein an element [Web page comprising of portlets] is comprises a markup language element (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the web page of Jerrad-Dunne using a markup language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

10.   **Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 46, 47, 49, 50 and 53 are**

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub

2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied respectively to claims 1, 22 and 42

above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0199541 to Goldberg et al (hereafter

Goldberg).

Referring to claim 7, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a first portlet [source portlet].

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first

portlet comprises a markup language anchor. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet

windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract),

including the further limitation wherein the first portlet [reporting portlet] comprises a

markup language anchor [at least one business result] (see [0051], lines 5-7 and Fig 4)

since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an

added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user (Goldberg: see

[0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by providing a link

to underlying data.

Referring to claim 8, Jerrard-Dunne discloses wherein said retrieving step

includes retrieving a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web page, database

content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel information]

(see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further

limitation wherein the step of retrieving is from a Common Gateway Interface. Goldberg

discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser

window and a step of retrieving information (see abstract), including the further limitation

of retrieving information from a Common Gateway Interface [internet gateway] (see

[0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard designed in order

to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to retrieve

information with the retrieving step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been

motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard designed in order

to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 10, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a messaging portlet [source

portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein

said messaging portlet is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline

frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed

within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said

messaging portlet [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a

HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the

portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections

[portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since

structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 11, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a listener portlet [destination

portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein

the listener portlet is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame.

Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within

a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the listener

portlet [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup

Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames

provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of

which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since

structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

Referring to claim 15, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a messaging portlet [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the messaging portlet is implemented using JavaScript. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said messaging portlet is implemented using JavaScript (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne in the form of JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

Referring to claim 16, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a messaging portlet [source portlet] sending a message to a listener portlet [destination portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message (see [0042], lines 1-

15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and

presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web

authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne in the form of JavaScript as

disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript

enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web

pages.

Referring to claim 28, Jerrard-Dunne discloses an actioner module [source

portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein

the actioner module comprises a markup language anchor. Goldberg discloses a

plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window

(see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the actioner module [reporting

portlet] comprises a markup language anchor [at least one business result] (see [0051],

lines 5-7 and Fig 4) since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a

high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance,

while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an

added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user (Goldberg: see [0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by providing a link to underlying data.

Referring to claim 29, Jerrard-Dunne discloses wherein at least one listener module retrieves a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web page, database content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel information] (see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the step of retrieving is from a Common Gateway Interface. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window and a step of retrieving information (see abstract), including the further limitation of retrieving information from a Common Gateway Interface [internet gateway] (see [0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to retrieve information with the retrieving step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 31, Jerrard-Dunne discloses an actioner module [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said actioner module is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said actioner module [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

Referring to claim 32, Jerrard-Dunne discloses at least one listener module [destination portlets]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said at least one listener module is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said at least one listener module [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame

[iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

Referring to claim 36, Jerrard-Dunne discloses an actioner module [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said actioner module is implemented using JavaScript. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said actioner module is implemented using JavaScript (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne in the form of JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript

enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web

pages.

Referring to claim 37, Jerrard-Dunne discloses an actioner module [source

portlet] sending a message in response to user interaction. However, Jerrard-Dunne

fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript

broadcast message. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further

limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message (see [0042], lines 1-

15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and

presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web

authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne in the form of JavaScript as

disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript

enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web

pages.

Referring to claim 46, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a first element [source portlet].

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first

element comprises a markup language anchor. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet

windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract),

including the further limitation wherein the first element [reporting portlet] comprises a

markup language anchor [at least one business result] (see [0051], lines 5-7 and Fig 4)

since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an

added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user (Goldberg: see

[0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by providing a link

to underlying data.

Referring to claim 47, Jerrard-Dunne discloses wherein said displaying step

includes displaying a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web page, database

content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel information]

(see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further

limitation wherein the step of displaying is from a Common Gateway Interface.

Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within

a browser window and a step of retrieving information (see abstract), including the

further limitation of retrieving information from a Common Gateway Interface [internet

gateway] (see [0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard

designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to display

information with the displaying step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been

motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard designed in order

to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 49, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a first element [source portlet].

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said first

element is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg

discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser

window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said first element [the

portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language

(HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the

ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be

scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since

structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 50, Jerrard-Dunne discloses at least one collaborative

element [destination portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the

further limitation wherein said at least one collaborative element is structured as a

HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of

portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract),

including the further limitation wherein said at least one collaborative element [the

portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language

(HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the

ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be

scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so since

structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 53, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a first element [source portlet]

sending a message in response to user interaction. However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to

explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast

message. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously

displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation

wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message (see [0042], lines 1-15 –

Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and

presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne in the form of JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

5 December 2006
kml
12/7/06 KmL

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

7 December 2006